# Thoughts for the activity

### Cards from article #1

#### Their strategy isn’t concrete enough simply saying <insert aff here> is nothing more than a password for others to join their movement. They don’t go far enough and if they do it isn’t said in a way that others can coalesce around.

Dr. Reed 9/09 The limits of anti-racism by Adolph Reed Jr., Adolph Reed Jr. is a professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania, his research interest include American and Afro-American politics and political thought; urban politics, and American political development. Left Business Observer #121, September 2009. Copyright 2009, Left Business Observer. http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Antiracism.html

Antiracism is a favorite concept on the American left these days. Of course, all good sorts want to be against racism, but what does the word mean exactly?

Tasty bunny

All too often, “racism” is the subject of sentences that imply intentional activity or is characterized as an autonomous “force.” In this kind of formulation, “racism,” a conceptual abstraction, is imagined as a material entity. Abstractions can be useful, but they shouldn’t be given independent life.

I can appreciate such formulations as transient political rhetoric; hyperbolic claims made in order to draw attention and galvanize opinion against some particular injustice. But as the basis for social interpretation, and particularly interpretation directed toward strategic political action, they are useless. Their principal function is to feel good and tastily righteous in the mouths of those who propound them. People do things that reproduce patterns of racialized inequality, sometimes with self-consciously bigoted motives, sometimes not. Properly speaking, however, “racism” itself doesn’t do anything more than the Easter Bunny does.

Yes, racism exists, as a conceptual condensation of practices and ideas that reproduce, or seek to reproduce, hierarchy along lines defined by race. Apostles of antiracism frequently can’t hear this sort of statement, because in their exceedingly simplistic version of the nexus of race and injustice there can be only the Manichean dichotomy of those who admit racism’s existence and those who deny it. There can be only Todd Gitlin (the sociologist and former SDS leader who has become, both fairly and as caricature, the symbol of a “class-first” line) and their own heroic, truth-telling selves, and whoever is not the latter must be the former. Thus the logic of straining to assign guilt by association substitutes for argument.

My position is—and I can’t count the number of times I’ve said this bluntly, yet to no avail, in response to those in blissful thrall of the comforting Manicheanism—that of course racism persists, in all the disparate, often unrelated kinds of social relations and “attitudes” that are characteristically lumped together under that rubric, but from the standpoint of trying to figure out how to combat even what most of us would agree is racial inequality and injustice, that acknowledgement and $2.25 will get me a ride on the subway. It doesn’t lend itself to any particular action except more taxonomic argument about what counts as racism.

#### Your engagement causes interracial debates that fracture the movement along the lines of you are black enough to be apart of our project

Dr. Reed 9/09 The limits of anti-racism by Adolph Reed Jr., Adolph Reed Jr. is a professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania, his research interest include American and Afro-American politics and political thought; urban politics, and American political development. Left Business Observer #121, September 2009. Copyright 2009, Left Business Observer. http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Antiracism.html

And here’s a practical catch-22. In the logic of antiracism, exposure of the racial element of an instance of wrongdoing will lead to recognition of injustice, which in turn will lead to remedial action—though not much attention seems ever given to how this part is supposed to work. I suspect this is because the exposure part, which feels so righteously yet undemandingly good, is the real focus. But this exposure convinces only those who are already disposed to recognize.

Those who aren’t so disposed have multiple layers of obfuscating ideology, mainly forms of victim-blaming, through which to deny that a given disparity stems from racism or for that matter is even unjust. The Simi Valley jury’s reaction to the Rodney King tape, which saw King as perp and the cops as victims, is a classic illustration. So is “underclass” discourse. Victimization by subprime mortgage scams can be, and frequently is, dismissed as the fault of irresponsible poor folks aspiring beyond their means. And there is no shortage of black people in the public eye—Bill Cosby and Oprah Winfrey are two prime examples, as is Barack Obama—who embrace and recycle those narratives of poor black Americans’ wayward behavior and self-destructive habits.

And how does a simple narrative of “racism” account for the fact that so many black institutions, including churches and some racial advocacy organizations, and many, many black individuals actively promoted those risky mortgages as making the “American Dream of home ownership” possible for “us”? Sure, there are analogies available—black slave traders, slave snitches, “Uncle Toms” and various race traitors—but those analogies are moral judgments, not explanations. And to mention them only opens up another second-order debate about racial authenticity—about who “really” represents the black community. Even Clarence Thomas sees himself as a proud black man representing the race’s best interests.

My point is that it’s more effective politically to challenge the inequality and injustice directly and bypass the debate over whether it should be called “racism.”

I do recognize that, partly because of the terms on which the civil rights movement’s victories have been achieved, there is a strong practical imperative for stressing the racially invidious aspects of injustices: they have legal remedies. Race is one of the legal classes protected by anti-discrimination law; poverty, for instance, is not. But this makes identifying “racism” a technical requirement for pursuing certain grievances, not the basis of an overall political strategy for pursuit of racial justice, or, as I believe is a clearer left formulation, racial equality as an essential component of a program of social justice.

#### Creating vague assemblages to challenge concrete institutional problems fail. Their <insert their strategy here> minus specific goals and tactics their aff is doomed to fail

Dr. Reed 9/09 The limits of anti-racism by Adolph Reed Jr., Adolph Reed Jr. is a professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania, his research interest include American and Afro-American politics and political thought; urban politics, and American political development. Left Business Observer #121, September 2009. Copyright 2009, Left Business Observer. http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Antiracism.html

Antiracism is a favorite concept on the American left these days. Of course, all good sorts want to be against racism, but what does the word mean exactly?

The contemporary discourse of “antiracism” is focused much more on taxonomy than politics. It emphasizes the name by which we should call some strains of inequality—whether they should be broadly recognized as evidence of “racism”— over specifying the mechanisms that produce them or even the steps that can be taken to combat them. And, no, neither “overcoming racism” nor “rejecting whiteness” qualifies as such a step any more than does waiting for the “revolution” or urging God’s heavenly intervention. If organizing a rally against racism seems at present to be a more substantive political act than attending a prayer vigil for world peace, that’s only because contemporary antiracist activists understand themselves to be employing the same tactics and pursuing the same ends as their predecessors in the period of high insurgency in the struggle against racial segregation.

This view, however, is mistaken. The postwar activism that reached its crescendo in the South as the “civil rights movement” wasn’t a movement against a generic “racism;” it was specifically and explicitly directed toward full citizenship rights for black Americans and against the system of racial segregation that defined a specific regime of explicitly racial subordination in the South. The 1940s March on Washington Movement was also directed against specific targets, like employment discrimination in defense production. Black Power era and post-Black Power era struggles similarly focused on combating specific inequalities and pursuing specific goals like the effective exercise of voting rights and specific programs of redistribution.

Clarity lost

Whether or not one considers those goals correct or appropriate, they were clear and strategic in a way that “antiracism” simply is not. Sure, those earlier struggles relied on a discourse of racial justice, but their targets were concrete and strategic. It is only in a period of political demobilization that the historical specificities of those struggles have become smoothed out of sight in a romantic idealism that homogenizes them into timeless abstractions like “the black liberation movement”—an entity that, like Brigadoon, sporadically appears and returns impelled by its own logic.

Ironically, as the basis for a politics, antiracism seems to reflect, several generations downstream, the victory of the postwar psychologists in depoliticizing the critique of racial injustice by shifting its focus from the social structures that generate and reproduce racial inequality to an ultimately individual, and ahistorical, domain of “prejudice” or “intolerance.” (No doubt this shift was partly aided by political imperatives associated with the Cold War and domestic anticommunism.) Beryl Satter’s recent book on the racialized political economy of “contract buying” in Chicago in the 1950s and 1960s, Family Properties: Race, Real Estate, and the Exploitation of Black Urban America, is a good illustration of how these processes worked; Robert Self’s book on Oakland since the 1930s, American Babylon, is another. Both make abundantly clear the role of the real estate industry in creating and recreating housing segregation and ghettoization.

### Cards from article #2

Dialectically- the art or practice of arriving at the truth

AT: the aff says we breakdown difference that anti-blackness produces to prevent Afro-Asian solidarity – we say we are kritiking the categorization you are using the concept of Asian as Chinese is problematic that’s the Taiwan arguments

—The doesn’t have fwk for determine who is and is not “black” that will cause divisions within the movement esp if people disagree on what is “black”

— Sui generis means unique

– Verisimilitude means the appearance of being true or real.

#### Alt- Marxism solves the aff—Historical materialism is necessary to demystifying both race and class. The aff is a ascriptive story which reconstitutes social privilege under the guise of coalition building. There is only a risk that the permutation could hijack the alt and refocus the group back to identities.

Dr. Reed 13 “Marx, Race, and Neoliberalism”., Adolph Reed Jr. is a professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania, his research interest include American and Afro-American politics and political thought; urban politics, and American political development. New Labor Forum 22(1) 49–57 Copyright © 2013, The Murphy Institute. Accessed on 7/17/16

A Marxist perspective can be most helpful for understanding race and racism insofar as it perceives capitalism dialectically, as a social totality that includes modes of production, relations of production, and the pragmatically evolving ensemble of institutions and ideologies that lubricate and propel its reproduction. From this perspective, Marxism’s most important contribution to making sense of race and racism in the United States may be demystification. A historical materialist perspective should stress that “race”—which includes “racism,” as one is unthinkable without the other—is a historically specific ideology that emerged, took shape, and has evolved as a constitutive element within a definite set of social relations anchored to a particular system of production.

Race is a taxonomy of ascriptive difference, that is, an ideology that constructs populations as groups and sorts them into hierarchies of capacity, civic worth, and desert based on “natural” or essential characteristics attributed to them. Ideologies of ascriptive difference help to stabilize a social order by legitimizing its hierarchies of wealth, power, and privilege, including its social division of labor, as the natural order of things ascriptive ideologies are just-so stories with the potential to become self-fulfilling prophecies. They emerge from self-interested common sense as folk knowledge: they are “known” to be true unreflectively because they seem to comport with the evidence of quotidian experience. They are likely to become generally assumed as self-evident truth, and imposed as such by law and custom, when they converge with and reinforce the interests of powerful strata in the society.

#### Focusing on identity justifies neoliberal takeover— Turns the aff— Focusing on identity allows neoliberalist to subvert the aff by establishing tokenism to a few and claiming liberation

Dr. Reed 13 “Marx, Race, and Neoliberalism”., Adolph Reed Jr. is a professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania, his research interest include American and Afro-American politics and political thought; urban politics, and American political development. New Labor Forum 22(1) 49–57 Copyright © 2013, The Murphy Institute. Accessed on 7/17/16

A second essentialist sleight-of-hand advances claims for the primacy of race/racism as an explanation of inequalities in the present by invoking analogies to regimes of explicitly racial subordination in the past. In these arguments, analogy stands in for evidence and explanation of the contemporary centrality of racism. Michelle Alexander’s widely read and cited book, The New Jim Crow, is only the most prominent expression of this tendency; even she has to acknowledge that the analogy fails because the historical circumstances are so radically different.

From the historical materialist standpoint, the view of racial inequality as a sui generis injustice and dichotomous formulations of the relation of race and class as systems of hierarchy in the United States are not only miscast but also fundamentally counterproductive. It is particularly important at this moment to recognize that the familiar taxonomy of racial difference is but one historically specific instance of a genus of ideologies of ascriptive hierarchy that stabilize capitalist social reproduction. I have argued previously that entirely new race-like taxonomies could come to displace the familiar ones. For instance, the “underclass” could become even more race-like as a distinctive, essentialized population, by our current folk norms, multiracial in composition, albeit most likely including in perceptibly greater frequencies people who would be classified as black and Latino “racially,” though as small enough pluralities to preclude assimilating the group ideologically as a simple proxy for nonwhite inferiors.

This possibility looms larger now. Struggles for racial and gender equality have largely divested race and gender of their common sense verisimilitude as bases for essential difference. Moreover, versions of racial and gender equality are now also incorporated into the normative and programmatic structure of “left” neoliberalism. Rigorous pursuit of equality of opportunity exclusively within the terms of given patterns of capitalist class relations—which is after all the ideal of racial liberalism—has been fully legitimized within the rubric of “diversity.” That ideal is realized through gaining rough parity in distribution of social goods and bads among designated population categories. As Walter Benn Michaels has argued powerfully, according to that ideal, the society would be just if 1 percent of the population controlled 90 percent of the resources, provided that blacks and other nonwhites, women, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) people were represented among the 1 percent in roughly similar proportion as their incidence in the general population.

#### We solve the aff— the K must come 1st. Affirming historical materialism as a lens to evaluate anti-blackness is key to aff solvency. Our evidence assumes the perm and concludes that affirming identity doom our method to fail.

Dr. Reed 13 “Marx, Race, and Neoliberalism”., Adolph Reed Jr. is a professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania, his research interest include American and Afro-American politics and political thought; urban politics, and American political development. New Labor Forum 22(1) 49–57 Copyright © 2013, The Murphy Institute. Accessed on 7/17/16

Finally, the adamant commitment to a race first perspective on inequalities that show up as statistical disparities has a material foundation. The victories of the civil rights movement carried with them a more benign and unavoidable political imperative. Legal remedies can be sought for injustices understood as discrimination on the basis of race, gender, or other familiar categories of invidious ascription; no such recourse exists for injustices generated through capitalism’s logic of production and reproduction without mediation through one of those ascriptive categories. As I have argued elsewhere, this makes identifying “racism” a technical requirement for pursuing certain grievances, not the basis of an overall strategy for pursuit of racial justice, or, as I believe is a clearer left formulation, racial equality as an essential component of a program of social justice.17

Yet, for those who insist that racial reductionism is more than a pragmatic accommodation to the necessities of pursuing legal or administrative grievances, something more is at play. A historical materialist perspective can be helpful for identifying the glue that binds that commitment to a race-first political discourse and practice.

All politics in capitalist society is class, or at least a class-inflected, politics. That is also true of the political perspective that condenses in programs such as reparations, antiracism, and insistence on the sui generis character of racial injustice. I submit that those tendencies come together around a politics that is “entirely consistent with the neoliberal redefinition of equality and democracy along disparitarian lines.” That politics reflects the social position of those positioned to benefit from the view that the market is, or can be, a just, effective, or even acceptable, system for rewarding talent and virtue and punishing their opposites and that, therefore, removal of “artificial” impediments to functioning like race and gender will make it even more efficient and just.18

### Cards from article #3

#### Assuming that Chinese and Taiwanese are the same is an independent reason to reject the aff— Affirming that notion is to affirm that Taiwanese people should not exist. This representation reproduces the thesis of the 1AC.

Chang 11’

Keng-Wei Chang, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Bachelor of Science (BS), Computer Science, November 28, 2011, “Why don’t people of Taiwan identify with “China” NOW? — Taiwanese Perspective”, <https://ilhaformosaaltomtaiwan.wordpress.com/2011/11/28/taiwan-dont-identify-with-china-en/>

These are probably the most common reactions mainland Chinese people have when they interact with someone from Taiwan, and they are always confused: why don’t Taiwanese think they are also Chinese? This is different from what they learned in school, where it is written in the textbooks that “we [Chinese] are connected to our Taiwanese brothers and sisters by blood.” Why is it that people of Taiwan don’t identify with “China” NOW, even though just two decades ago most Taiwanese still considered themselves to be Chinese? This article will try to explain the reasons of the dramatic change occurred to the identity of Taiwanese people. However, it is important to recognize the important yet confusing concept of that this change in identity is not the same as supporting the so-called “Taiwan Independence“, they are two completely separate issues.

Introduction: The Original Taiwanese Identity

Anyone who went to elementary schools in Taiwan during the authoritarian rule of KMT (1945 – late 1980s, martial law enforced) will remember those standardized workbooks/notebooks. It’s hard to forget about them after using them for six years. But to use the modern aesthetic standard, the workbooks could at most be considered as vulgar. Children being children, they don’t really have an idea of just how ugly these workbooks are. On the back of each of these workbooks, were two sentences: “Be a student who is active and lively, be a Chinese who is open and aboveboard.”

Because of this, identity was never an issue in Taiwan. Most people considered themselves to be Chinese, and learned about Mainland China through the governmental media instead of personal experiences. In addition, because of the Cold War that was going on during this period, the “China” recognized internationally and represented the entire geographic region of modern-day China and Taiwan was still the Republic of China 中華民國. The idea of people living in Taiwan were indeed Chinese became rooted deeply in many people’s mind. (Translator note: ROC was one of the founding members and a permanent member in the Security Council of the UN since its establishment in 1945. However, in 1971, the UN General Assembly recognized PRC instead to represent “China”, the territory of which was left unspecified. Read more in Taiwan the Complicated.)

But this was in the martial law period. As Taiwan underwent democratization and the first cross-strait interactions were initiated in late-1980s, the identity of people of Taiwan also underwent significant changes.

1. The change of what “China” meant and the (un)reality of politics

In the 1970s, the United States gradually altered its policy in the Cold War, and cooperated with PRC to contain the Soviet Union. This caused the more isolated PRC to slowly step onto the center of the world stage. The ROC was becoming less and less recognized, both as the name of the state and as a nation. Under the atmosphere where “China = People’s Republic of China”, a concept recognized by most nations, the PRC used massive propaganda to propagate that ROC no longer exists, that only PRC represents China, and that ROC can no longer be present on the world stage. This attitude of not recognizing Taiwan is also China (ROC) led to the conclusion that Taiwanese are not citizens of the ROC. For many this led to a question: “If Chinese = being citizen of PRC (and that Chinese ≠ citizen of ROC), and I am not a citizen of PRC, am I still Chinese?”

Under this logic, people of Taiwan felt that “China” is taken by mainlanders of PRC. Thus when being questioned by a citizen of PRC, “are you Chinese?” people of Taiwan naturally assume the “Chinese” mainlanders referring to is a citizen of PRC. Since people of Taiwan do not hold PRC passports, the most natural answer is of course “I am not Chinese.”

Long story short, to avoid being confused with PRC, ROC on Taiwan has to separate itself from PRC. Thus “Taiwan” becomes the branding for ROC, just like “China” is the branding for PRC.

PRC’s political attitude on not recognizing the fact that ROC actually exists directly rejects the sense of existence of people of Taiwan. Forcing the categorization of people of Taiwan as part of people of PRC is extremely disrespectful and offensive, which led to the resentment toward the PRC government among people of Taiwan, and thus influencing how people of Taiwan identify themselves.

#### Yes there is a difference between Chinese and Taiwanese

Chang 11’

Keng-Wei Chang, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Bachelor of Science (BS), Computer Science, November 28, 2011, “Why don’t people of Taiwan identify with “China” NOW? — Taiwanese Perspective”, <https://ilhaformosaaltomtaiwan.wordpress.com/2011/11/28/taiwan-dont-identify-with-china-en/>

To make Taiwanese feel that Taiwanese culture is a part of Chinese culture and to identify themselves as Chinese: the easiest way to achieve this is to let Taiwanese feel that the culture in Taiwan now is the same as that in Mainland China. But due to the six decades of separation, people on different side of the Taiwan Strait have lived under different social system and climate. Thus the evolution of culture on the two sides and their attitudes toward traditional cultures have also varied significantly. It is this difference that makes Taiwanese feel the difference between Taiwan and China.

In terms of cultural evolution, the two sides of the Taiwan Strait have been through different political systems and their own historical events since 1949. This caused cultures in Taiwan and China, both originally part of the Sinosphere, to diverge. For example, the use of traditional and simplified written Chinese made the dictionaries of the two sides completely different. It is very likely that one day the difference in vocabulary between Taiwan and China will be more varied than the difference between British and American English.

Not to mention that people of Taiwan and China seldom have the same feeling or reaction toward the same event. For example, when Liu Xiang won the gold medal in the Olympics, Chinese people felt proud as ever while Taiwanese people felt nothing. On the other hand, when Chien-Ming Wang won in the MLB, Taiwanese people felt happier than ever while Chinese people had no idea who he is. The difference is even more obvious toward political events, for example when President Lee Tung-hui visited the US in 1995, Chinese and Taiwanese people had completely opposite reactions.

In terms of preservation of traditional cultures, significant difference exists between the two sides. Because of the “breaking down the four olds, setting up the fours news” and related activities in the Cultural Revolution, the Mainland China was not friendly towards the traditional cultures. This was one main reason where cultures in Taiwan and China diverged.

For example in the folk religions of Taiwan, our Buddhism and Taoism both have their roots traced to Mainland China. Mazu in Taiwan could be traced to Meizhou, Putian, Fujian. Sanshanguowang (literally “god of the three mountains”, an important deity for the Hakka people) could be traced to Chaozhou, Guangdong. But because of the Cultural Revolution, significant number of temples in Mainland China were damaged or destroyed, for example, the Mazu Temple in Meizhou and the Sanshanguowang Temple in Chaozhou. Statues in temples were destroyed, the building of the temples themselves were teared down, worship ceremonies were halted, while religious staff had to undergo struggle sessions and other prosecutions. Even though after reform many temples received assistance from their counterparts in Taiwan, the feelings of coming from the same origin are very much lost.

Moreover, as PRC promotes materialism and is officially an atheist state, religious activities are discouraged. The religious activities such as incense-offering and pilgrimage often seen in Taiwan ceased to exist in Mainland China. What originally was part of the traditional Chinese daily life grew deep roots in Taiwan instead. In the eyes of Taiwanese people, the so-called religious ceremonies and traditional activities in China have more value in performance than in the actual religious ideas. In Taiwan, they are part of the daily life.

And because the Chinese Communist Party has strict restriction towards religions, the CCP organization is a deep part of any religious organizations, creating many religious staff who often do not follow the teaching of the religions they are supposed to be serving. Buddhist monks often do not behave like monks, while daoshi (Taoism monks/priests) don’t behave like daoshi. The head of the Shaolin Temple on Songshan, Henan is given the title “CEO of Shaolin Temple”, commercializing the temple and made it lose the solemnity it is supposed to have.

On the other hand, Taiwan is an obvious contrast. The attitude towards folk religion and traditional cultures are completely different in Taiwan. Every town in Taiwan grows around the local central temple. The temple serves as a gathering place in farming villages for all sorts of different functions. Sometimes the temple even becomes where street food stands gather, creating night markets.

To worship the gods is a part of Taiwanese people’s lives (except for atheists and people believing in other religions). People go to the temples to ask for help when encountering any types of difficulties. From a modern perspective this might seen unscientific and superstitious, but people still follow the habits of their ancestors to ask for help from the gods. You can find couples asking for love from the Old Man under the Moon; students preparing for important exams asking for a smooth exam-taking from Wenchang Dijun (god of culture and literature); and wedded women asking for a healthy child from the the Maiden who brings Children. All these could be seen in temples around the island at any given point of time. While people relate their problems and hope to the gods in a faithful manner, what they are actually doing for the most part is showing their appreciations for the gods.

So in the Taiwanese religions, you will find people’s attitudes toward anything un-materialistic are sincerity, honesty, and respect. This spirit of sincerity, honesty, and respect is what symbolizes the Chinese culture, but these traditional values just don’t seem to exist in the hearts of Chinese people anymore.

### Cards from article #4

#### The 1ac conceives of identity as oneness – this erases the multiplicity and uniqueness of the individual

**Hall 90**. STUART HALL is a professor in the Department of Social Science, The Open University, Milton Keynes. "Cultural identity and diaspora." (1990): 222-37. http://www.anthropology.ir/sites/default/files/hall\_cultural\_identity.pdf

A new cinema of the Caribbean is emerging, joining the company of the other 'Third Cinemas'. It is related to, but different from the vibrant film and other forms of visual representation of the Afro-Caribbean (and Asian) 'blacks' of the diasporas of the West - the new post-colonial subjects. All these cultural practices and forms of representation have the black subject at their centre, **putting the issue of cultural identity in question**. Who is this emergent, new subject of the cinema? From where does he/she speak? Practices of representation always implicate the positions from which we speak or write - the positions of enunciation. What recent theories of enunciation suggest is that, **though we speak**, so to say **'in our own name'**, of ourselves and from our own experience, nevertheless who speaks, and the subject who is spoken of, are never identical, never exactly in the same place. **Identity is not as transparent or unproblematic as we think**. Perhaps instead of thinking of identity as an already accomplished fact, which the new cultural practices then represent, **we should think**, instead, **of identity as a 'production', which is** never complete, **always in process**, and always constituted within, not outside, representation. This view **problematises the very authority and authenticity** to which the term, 'cultural identity', lays claim.

We seek, here, to open a dialogue, an investigation, on the subject of cultural identity and representation. Of course, the 'I' who writes here must also be thought of as, itself, 'enunciated'. We all write and speak from a **particular place and time**, from a history and a culture which is specific. What we say is always 'in context', positioned. I was born into and spent my childhood and adolescence in a lowermiddle-class family in Jamaica. I have lived all my adult life in England, in the shadow of the black diaspora - 'in the belly of the beast'. I write against the background of a lifetime's work in cultural studies. If the paper seems preoccupied with the diaspora experience and its narratives of displacement, it is worth remembering that all discourse is 'placed', and the heart has its reasons.

**There are** at least **two** different **ways of thinking about** 'cultural **identity'**. The first position defines 'cultural identity' **in terms of one**, shared culture, a sort of **collective** 'one **true self'**, hiding inside the many other, more superficial or artificially imposed 'selves', which people with a shared history and ancestry hold in common. Within the terms of this definition, our cultural identities reflect the common historical experiences and shared cultural codes which provide us, as **'one people', with stable, unchanging and continuous** frames of reference and meaning, beneath the shifting divisions and vicissitudes of our actual history. **This 'oneness'**, underlying all the other, more superficial differences, **is the truth**, the essence, of 'Caribbeanness', of the black experience. It is this identity which a Caribbean or black diaspora must discover, excavate, bring to light and **express through cinematic representation**.

Such a conception of cultural identity played a critical role in all the **post-colonial struggles** which have so profoundly reshaped our world. It lay at the centre of the vision of the poets of 'Negritude', like Aimee Ceasire and Leopold Senghor, and of the Pan-African political project, earlier in the century. It continues to be a very powerful and creative force in emergent forms of representation amongst hitherto marginalised peoples. In post-colonial societies, the rediscovery of this identity is often the object of what Frantz Fanon once called a

passionate research ... directed by the secret hope of discovering beyond the misery of today, beyond self-contempt, resignation and abjuration, some very beautiful and splendid era whose existence rehabilitates us both in regard to ourselves and in regard to others.

New forms of cultural practice in these societies address themselves to this project for the very good reason that, as Fanon puts it, in the recent past,

Colonisation is not satisfied merely with holding a people in its grip and emptying the native's brain of all form and content. By a kind of perverted logic, it turns to the past of oppressed people, and distorts, disfigures and destroys it.1

The question which Fanon's observation poses is, what is the nature of this 'profound research' which drives the new forms of visual and cinematic representation? Is it only a matter of unearthing that which the colonial experience buried and overlaid, bringing to light the hidden continuities it suppressed? Or is a quite different practice entailed - not the rediscovery but the production of identity. Not an identity grounded in the archaeology, but in the re-telling of the past?

We should not, for a moment, underestimate or neglect the importance of the act of imaginative rediscovery which this conception of a rediscovered, essential identity entails. 'Hidden histories' have played a critical role in the emergence of many of the most important social movements of our time - feminist, anti-colonial and anti-racist. The photographic work of a generation of Jamaican and Rastafarian artists, or of a visual artist like Armet Francis (a Jamaican-born photographer who has lived in Britain since the age of eight) is a testimony to the continuing creative power of this conception of identity within the emerging practices of representation. Francis's photographs of the peoples of The Black Triangle, taken in Africa, the Caribbean, the USA and the UK, attempt to reconstruct in visual terms 'the underlying unity of the black people whom colonisation and slavery distributed across the African diaspora.' His text is an act of imaginary reunification.

**Crucially, such images offer a way of imposing** an imaginary **coherence on the experience of** dispersal and **fragmentation**, which is the history of all enforced diasporas. They do this by representing or 'figuring' Africa as the mother of these different civilisations. This Triangle is, after all, 'centred' in Africa. Africa is the name of the missing term, the great aporia, which lies at the centre of our cultural identity and gives it a meaning which, until recently, it lacked. No one who looks at these textural images now, in the light of the history of transportation, slavery and migration, can fail to understand how the rift of separation, the **'loss of identity'**, which has been integral to the Caribbean experience only begins to be healed when these forgotten connections **are once more set in place**. Such texts **restore an imaginary fullness** or plentitude, to set against the **broken rubric of our past**. They are resources of resistance and identity, with which to confront the fragmented and pathological ways in which that experience has been reconstructed within the dominant regimes of cinematic and visual representation of the West.

There is, however, a **second**, related but **different view** of cultural identity. This second position recognises that, as well as the many points of similarity, there are also critical points of deep and **significant difference which constitute 'what we really are'; or rather** - since history has intervened - **'what we have become'**. We cannot speak for very long, with any exactness, about **'one experience, one identity'**, without acknowledging its other side - **the ruptures and discontinuities which constitute**, precisely, the Caribbean's **'uniqueness'**. Cultural identity, in this second sense, is a matter of 'becoming' as well as of 'being'. It belongs to the future as much as to the past. It is **not something which already exists, transcending place, time, history and culture**. Cultural identities come from somewhere, have histories. But, like everything which is historical, they undergo **constant transformation**. Far from being eternally **fixed in some essentialised past**, they are subject to the continuous 'play' of history, culture and power. Far from being grounded in a mere 'recovery' of the past, which is waiting to be found, and which, when found, will secure our sense of ourselves into eternity, identities are the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past.

#### The impact is violence to the other – internal normalization constitutes deviance and violence. They can’t understand the traumatic colonial experience

**Hall 90**. STUART HALL is a professor in the Department of Social Science, The Open University, Milton Keynes. "Cultural identity and diaspora." (1990): 222-37. http://www.anthropology.ir/sites/default/files/hall\_cultural\_identity.pdf

It is only from this second position that we can properly **understand the traumatic** character of 'the **colonial experience'**. The ways in which black people, black experiences, were positioned and subject-ed in the dominant regimes of representation **were the effects of** a critical exercise of cultural **power and normalisation**. Not only, in Said's 'Orientalist' sense, were we constructed as different and other within the categories of knowledge of the West by those regimes. They had the power to make us see and experience ourselves as 'Other'. Every regime of representation is a regime of power formed, as Foucault reminds us, by the fatal couplet, 'power/knowledge'. But this kind of knowledge is internal, not external. It is one thing to position a subject or set of peoples as the Other of a dominant discourse. It is quite another thing to subject them to that 'knowledge', not only as a matter of imposed will and domination, **by the power of inner compulsion** and subjective con-formation to the norm. **That is the lesson** - the sombre majesty - **of Fanon**'s insight into the colonising experience in Black Skin, White Masks.

This inner expropriation of cultural identity cripples and deforms. **If** its silences are **not resisted, they produce, in Fanon's vivid phrase, 'individuals without an anchor**, without horizon, colourless, stateless, rootless - a race of angels'.2 Nevertheless, this idea of **otherness as an inner compulsion changes our conception of** 'cultural **identity'**. In this perspective, cultural **identity is not a fixed essence at all**, lying unchanged outside history and culture. **It is not** some **universal and transcendental** spirit inside us on which history has made no fundamental mark. It is not once-and-for-all. **It is not a fixed origin to which we can make some final and absolute Return**. Of course, it is not a mere phantasm either. It is something - not a mere trick of the imagination. It has its histories - and histories have their real, material and symbolic effects. The past continues to speak to us. But it no longer addresses us as a simple, factual 'past', since our relation to **it**, like the child's relation to the mother, **is always-already 'after the break'.** It is always constructed through memory, fantasy, narrative and myth. Cultural identities are the points of identification, the unstable points of identification or suture, which are made, within the discourses of history and culture. **Not an essence but a positioning**. Hence, **there is always a politics of identity**, a politics of position, which has no absolute guarantee in an unproblematic, transcendental 'law of origin'.

This second view of cultural identity is much less familiar, and more unsettling. If identity does not proceed, in a straight, unbroken line, from some fixed origin, how are we to understand its formation? **We might think of** black Caribbean **identities as 'framed' by** two axes or **vectors, simultaneously operative**: the vector of similarity and continuity; and the vector of difference and rupture. Caribbean **identities always have to be thought of in terms of the dialogic relationship between** these two **axes**. The one gives us some grounding in, some continuity with, the past. The second reminds us that what we share is precisely the experience of a profound discontinuity: the peoples dragged into slavery, transportation, colonisation, migration, came predominantly from Africa - and when that supply ended, it was temporarily refreshed by indentured labour from the Asian subcontinent. (This neglected fact explains why, when you visit Guyana or Trinidad, you see, symbolically inscribed in the faces of their peoples, the paradoxical 'truth' of Christopher Columbus's mistake: you can find 'Asia' by sailing west, if you know where to look!) In the history of the modern world, there are few more traumatic ruptures to match these enforced separations from Africa - already figured, in the European imaginary, as 'the Dark Continent'. But the slaves were also from different countries, tribal communities, villages, languages and gods. African religion, which has been so profoundly formative in Caribbean spiritual life, is precisely different from Christian monotheism in believing that God is so powerful that he can only be known through a proliferation of spiritual manifestations, present everywhere in the natural and social world. These gods live on, in an underground existence, **in the hybridised religious universe** of Haitian voodoo, pocomania, Native pentacostalism, Black baptism, Rastafarianism and the black Saints Latin American Catholicism. The paradox is that it was the uprooting of slavery and transportation and the insertion into the plantation economy (as well as the symbolic economy) of **the** Western **world that 'unified' these peoples** across their differences, in the same moment as it **cut them off from direct access to their past**.

**Difference**, therefore, **persists** - in and alongside continuity. To return to the Caribbean after any long absence is to experience again the shock of the 'doubleness' of similarity and difference. Visiting the French Caribbean for the first time, I also saw at once how different Martinique is from, say, Jamaica: and this is no mere difference of topography or climate. It is a profound difference of culture and history. **And the difference matters**. It positions Martiniquains and Jamaicans as both the same and different. Moreover, the boundaries of difference are continually repositioned in relation to different points of reference. Vis-a-vis the developed West, we are very much 'the same'. We belong to the marginal, the underdeveloped, the periphery, the 'Other'. We are at the outer edge, the 'rim', of the metropolitan world - always 'South' to someone else's El Norte.

At the same time, we do not stand in the same relation of the 'otherness' to the metropolitan centres. Each has negotiated its economic, political and cultural dependency differently. And this **'difference'**, whether we like it or not, **is already inscribed in our cultural identities**. In turn, it is this negotiation of identity which makes us, vis-a-vis other Latin American people, with a very similar history, different - Caribbeans, les Antilliennes ('islanders' to their mainland). And yet, vis-a-vis one another, Jamaican, Haitian, Cuban, Guadeloupean, Barbadian, etc ...

# Potential K

### Top Shelf

#### The 1ac conceives of identity as oneness – this erases the multiplicity and uniqueness of the individual

**Hall 90**. STUART HALL is a professor in the Department of Social Science, The Open University, Milton Keynes. "Cultural identity and diaspora." (1990): 222-37. http://www.anthropology.ir/sites/default/files/hall\_cultural\_identity.pdf

A new cinema of the Caribbean is emerging, joining the company of the other 'Third Cinemas'. It is related to, but different from the vibrant film and other forms of visual representation of the Afro-Caribbean (and Asian) 'blacks' of the diasporas of the West - the new post-colonial subjects. All these cultural practices and forms of representation have the black subject at their centre, **putting the issue of cultural identity in question**. Who is this emergent, new subject of the cinema? From where does he/she speak? Practices of representation always implicate the positions from which we speak or write - the positions of enunciation. What recent theories of enunciation suggest is that, **though we speak**, so to say **'in our own name'**, of ourselves and from our own experience, nevertheless who speaks, and the subject who is spoken of, are never identical, never exactly in the same place. **Identity is not as transparent or unproblematic as we think**. Perhaps instead of thinking of identity as an already accomplished fact, which the new cultural practices then represent, **we should think**, instead, **of identity as a 'production', which is** never complete, **always in process**, and always constituted within, not outside, representation. This view **problematises the very authority and authenticity** to which the term, 'cultural identity', lays claim.

We seek, here, to open a dialogue, an investigation, on the subject of cultural identity and representation. Of course, the 'I' who writes here must also be thought of as, itself, 'enunciated'. We all write and speak from a **particular place and time**, from a history and a culture which is specific. What we say is always 'in context', positioned. I was born into and spent my childhood and adolescence in a lowermiddle-class family in Jamaica. I have lived all my adult life in England, in the shadow of the black diaspora - 'in the belly of the beast'. I write against the background of a lifetime's work in cultural studies. If the paper seems preoccupied with the diaspora experience and its narratives of displacement, it is worth remembering that all discourse is 'placed', and the heart has its reasons.

**There are** at least **two** different **ways of thinking about** 'cultural **identity'**. The first position defines 'cultural identity' **in terms of one**, shared culture, a sort of **collective** 'one **true self'**, hiding inside the many other, more superficial or artificially imposed 'selves', which people with a shared history and ancestry hold in common. Within the terms of this definition, our cultural identities reflect the common historical experiences and shared cultural codes which provide us, as **'one people', with stable, unchanging and continuous** frames of reference and meaning, beneath the shifting divisions and vicissitudes of our actual history. **This 'oneness'**, underlying all the other, more superficial differences, **is the truth**, the essence, of 'Caribbeanness', of the black experience. It is this identity which a Caribbean or black diaspora must discover, excavate, bring to light and **express through cinematic representation**.

Such a conception of cultural identity played a critical role in all the **post-colonial struggles** which have so profoundly reshaped our world. It lay at the centre of the vision of the poets of 'Negritude', like Aimee Ceasire and Leopold Senghor, and of the Pan-African political project, earlier in the century. It continues to be a very powerful and creative force in emergent forms of representation amongst hitherto marginalised peoples. In post-colonial societies, the rediscovery of this identity is often the object of what Frantz Fanon once called a

passionate research ... directed by the secret hope of discovering beyond the misery of today, beyond self-contempt, resignation and abjuration, some very beautiful and splendid era whose existence rehabilitates us both in regard to ourselves and in regard to others.

New forms of cultural practice in these societies address themselves to this project for the very good reason that, as Fanon puts it, in the recent past,

Colonisation is not satisfied merely with holding a people in its grip and emptying the native's brain of all form and content. By a kind of perverted logic, it turns to the past of oppressed people, and distorts, disfigures and destroys it.1

The question which Fanon's observation poses is, what is the nature of this 'profound research' which drives the new forms of visual and cinematic representation? Is it only a matter of unearthing that which the colonial experience buried and overlaid, bringing to light the hidden continuities it suppressed? Or is a quite different practice entailed - not the rediscovery but the production of identity. Not an identity grounded in the archaeology, but in the re-telling of the past?

We should not, for a moment, underestimate or neglect the importance of the act of imaginative rediscovery which this conception of a rediscovered, essential identity entails. 'Hidden histories' have played a critical role in the emergence of many of the most important social movements of our time - feminist, anti-colonial and anti-racist. The photographic work of a generation of Jamaican and Rastafarian artists, or of a visual artist like Armet Francis (a Jamaican-born photographer who has lived in Britain since the age of eight) is a testimony to the continuing creative power of this conception of identity within the emerging practices of representation. Francis's photographs of the peoples of The Black Triangle, taken in Africa, the Caribbean, the USA and the UK, attempt to reconstruct in visual terms 'the underlying unity of the black people whom colonisation and slavery distributed across the African diaspora.' His text is an act of imaginary reunification.

**Crucially, such images offer a way of imposing** an imaginary **coherence on the experience of** dispersal and **fragmentation**, which is the history of all enforced diasporas. They do this by representing or 'figuring' Africa as the mother of these different civilisations. This Triangle is, after all, 'centred' in Africa. Africa is the name of the missing term, the great aporia, which lies at the centre of our cultural identity and gives it a meaning which, until recently, it lacked. No one who looks at these textural images now, in the light of the history of transportation, slavery and migration, can fail to understand how the rift of separation, the **'loss of identity'**, which has been integral to the Caribbean experience only begins to be healed when these forgotten connections **are once more set in place**. Such texts **restore an imaginary fullness** or plentitude, to set against the **broken rubric of our past**. They are resources of resistance and identity, with which to confront the fragmented and pathological ways in which that experience has been reconstructed within the dominant regimes of cinematic and visual representation of the West.

There is, however, a **second**, related but **different view** of cultural identity. This second position recognises that, as well as the many points of similarity, there are also critical points of deep and **significant difference which constitute 'what we really are'; or rather** - since history has intervened - **'what we have become'**. We cannot speak for very long, with any exactness, about **'one experience, one identity'**, without acknowledging its other side - **the ruptures and discontinuities which constitute**, precisely, the Caribbean's **'uniqueness'**. Cultural identity, in this second sense, is a matter of 'becoming' as well as of 'being'. It belongs to the future as much as to the past. It is **not something which already exists, transcending place, time, history and culture**. Cultural identities come from somewhere, have histories. But, like everything which is historical, they undergo **constant transformation**. Far from being eternally **fixed in some essentialised past**, they are subject to the continuous 'play' of history, culture and power. Far from being grounded in a mere 'recovery' of the past, which is waiting to be found, and which, when found, will secure our sense of ourselves into eternity, identities are the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past.

#### Creating vague assemblages to challenge concrete institutional problems fail. Their <insert their strategy here> minus specific goals and tactics their aff is doomed to fail

Dr. Reed 9/09 The limits of anti-racism by Adolph Reed Jr., Adolph Reed Jr. is a professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania, his research interest include American and Afro-American politics and political thought; urban politics, and American political development. Left Business Observer #121, September 2009. Copyright 2009, Left Business Observer. http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Antiracism.html

Antiracism is a favorite concept on the American left these days. Of course, all good sorts want to be against racism, but what does the word mean exactly?

The contemporary discourse of “antiracism” is focused much more on taxonomy than politics. It emphasizes the name by which we should call some strains of inequality—whether they should be broadly recognized as evidence of “racism”— over specifying the mechanisms that produce them or even the steps that can be taken to combat them. And, no, neither “overcoming racism” nor “rejecting whiteness” qualifies as such a step any more than does waiting for the “revolution” or urging God’s heavenly intervention. If organizing a rally against racism seems at present to be a more substantive political act than attending a prayer vigil for world peace, that’s only because contemporary antiracist activists understand themselves to be employing the same tactics and pursuing the same ends as their predecessors in the period of high insurgency in the struggle against racial segregation.

This view, however, is mistaken. The postwar activism that reached its crescendo in the South as the “civil rights movement” wasn’t a movement against a generic “racism;” it was specifically and explicitly directed toward full citizenship rights for black Americans and against the system of racial segregation that defined a specific regime of explicitly racial subordination in the South. The 1940s March on Washington Movement was also directed against specific targets, like employment discrimination in defense production. Black Power era and post-Black Power era struggles similarly focused on combating specific inequalities and pursuing specific goals like the effective exercise of voting rights and specific programs of redistribution.

Clarity lost

Whether or not one considers those goals correct or appropriate, they were clear and strategic in a way that “antiracism” simply is not. Sure, those earlier struggles relied on a discourse of racial justice, but their targets were concrete and strategic. It is only in a period of political demobilization that the historical specificities of those struggles have become smoothed out of sight in a romantic idealism that homogenizes them into timeless abstractions like “the black liberation movement”—an entity that, like Brigadoon, sporadically appears and returns impelled by its own logic.

Ironically, as the basis for a politics, antiracism seems to reflect, several generations downstream, the victory of the postwar psychologists in depoliticizing the critique of racial injustice by shifting its focus from the social structures that generate and reproduce racial inequality to an ultimately individual, and ahistorical, domain of “prejudice” or “intolerance.” (No doubt this shift was partly aided by political imperatives associated with the Cold War and domestic anticommunism.) Beryl Satter’s recent book on the racialized political economy of “contract buying” in Chicago in the 1950s and 1960s, Family Properties: Race, Real Estate, and the Exploitation of Black Urban America, is a good illustration of how these processes worked; Robert Self’s book on Oakland since the 1930s, American Babylon, is another. Both make abundantly clear the role of the real estate industry in creating and recreating housing segregation and ghettoization.

#### Assuming that Chinese and Taiwanese are the same is an independent reason to reject the aff— Affirming that notion is to affirm that Taiwanese people should not exist. This representation reproduces the thesis of the 1AC.

Chang 11’

Keng-Wei Chang, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Bachelor of Science (BS), Computer Science, November 28, 2011, “Why don’t people of Taiwan identify with “China” NOW? — Taiwanese Perspective”, <https://ilhaformosaaltomtaiwan.wordpress.com/2011/11/28/taiwan-dont-identify-with-china-en/>

These are probably the most common reactions mainland Chinese people have when they interact with someone from Taiwan, and they are always confused: why don’t Taiwanese think they are also Chinese? This is different from what they learned in school, where it is written in the textbooks that “we [Chinese] are connected to our Taiwanese brothers and sisters by blood.” Why is it that people of Taiwan don’t identify with “China” NOW, even though just two decades ago most Taiwanese still considered themselves to be Chinese? This article will try to explain the reasons of the dramatic change occurred to the identity of Taiwanese people. However, it is important to recognize the important yet confusing concept of that this change in identity is not the same as supporting the so-called “Taiwan Independence“, they are two completely separate issues.

Introduction: The Original Taiwanese Identity

Anyone who went to elementary schools in Taiwan during the authoritarian rule of KMT (1945 – late 1980s, martial law enforced) will remember those standardized workbooks/notebooks. It’s hard to forget about them after using them for six years. But to use the modern aesthetic standard, the workbooks could at most be considered as vulgar. Children being children, they don’t really have an idea of just how ugly these workbooks are. On the back of each of these workbooks, were two sentences: “Be a student who is active and lively, be a Chinese who is open and aboveboard.”

Because of this, identity was never an issue in Taiwan. Most people considered themselves to be Chinese, and learned about Mainland China through the governmental media instead of personal experiences. In addition, because of the Cold War that was going on during this period, the “China” recognized internationally and represented the entire geographic region of modern-day China and Taiwan was still the Republic of China 中華民國. The idea of people living in Taiwan were indeed Chinese became rooted deeply in many people’s mind. (Translator note: ROC was one of the founding members and a permanent member in the Security Council of the UN since its establishment in 1945. However, in 1971, the UN General Assembly recognized PRC instead to represent “China”, the territory of which was left unspecified. Read more in Taiwan the Complicated.)

But this was in the martial law period. As Taiwan underwent democratization and the first cross-strait interactions were initiated in late-1980s, the identity of people of Taiwan also underwent significant changes.

1. The change of what “China” meant and the (un)reality of politics

In the 1970s, the United States gradually altered its policy in the Cold War, and cooperated with PRC to contain the Soviet Union. This caused the more isolated PRC to slowly step onto the center of the world stage. The ROC was becoming less and less recognized, both as the name of the state and as a nation. Under the atmosphere where “China = People’s Republic of China”, a concept recognized by most nations, the PRC used massive propaganda to propagate that ROC no longer exists, that only PRC represents China, and that ROC can no longer be present on the world stage. This attitude of not recognizing Taiwan is also China (ROC) led to the conclusion that Taiwanese are not citizens of the ROC. For many this led to a question: “If Chinese = being citizen of PRC (and that Chinese ≠ citizen of ROC), and I am not a citizen of PRC, am I still Chinese?”

Under this logic, people of Taiwan felt that “China” is taken by mainlanders of PRC. Thus when being questioned by a citizen of PRC, “are you Chinese?” people of Taiwan naturally assume the “Chinese” mainlanders referring to is a citizen of PRC. Since people of Taiwan do not hold PRC passports, the most natural answer is of course “I am not Chinese.”

Long story short, to avoid being confused with PRC, ROC on Taiwan has to separate itself from PRC. Thus “Taiwan” becomes the branding for ROC, just like “China” is the branding for PRC.

PRC’s political attitude on not recognizing the fact that ROC actually exists directly rejects the sense of existence of people of Taiwan. Forcing the categorization of people of Taiwan as part of people of PRC is extremely disrespectful and offensive, which led to the resentment toward the PRC government among people of Taiwan, and thus influencing how people of Taiwan identify themselves.

#### Alt- Marxism solves the aff—Historical materialism is necessary to demystifying both race and class. The aff is a ascriptive story which reconstitutes social privilege under the guise of coalition building. There is only a risk that the permutation could hijack the alt and refocus the group back to identities.

Dr. Reed 13 “Marx, Race, and Neoliberalism”., Adolph Reed Jr. is a professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania, his research interest include American and Afro-American politics and political thought; urban politics, and American political development. New Labor Forum 22(1) 49–57 Copyright © 2013, The Murphy Institute. Accessed on 7/17/16

A Marxist perspective can be most helpful for understanding race and racism insofar as it perceives capitalism dialectically, as a social totality that includes modes of production, relations of production, and the pragmatically evolving ensemble of institutions and ideologies that lubricate and propel its reproduction. From this perspective, Marxism’s most important contribution to making sense of race and racism in the United States may be demystification. A historical materialist perspective should stress that “race”—which includes “racism,” as one is unthinkable without the other—is a historically specific ideology that emerged, took shape, and has evolved as a constitutive element within a definite set of social relations anchored to a particular system of production.

Race is a taxonomy of ascriptive difference, that is, an ideology that constructs populations as groups and sorts them into hierarchies of capacity, civic worth, and desert based on “natural” or essential characteristics attributed to them. Ideologies of ascriptive difference help to stabilize a social order by legitimizing its hierarchies of wealth, power, and privilege, including its social division of labor, as the natural order of things ascriptive ideologies are just-so stories with the potential to become self-fulfilling prophecies. They emerge from self-interested common sense as folk knowledge: they are “known” to be true unreflectively because they seem to comport with the evidence of quotidian experience. They are likely to become generally assumed as self-evident truth, and imposed as such by law and custom, when they converge with and reinforce the interests of powerful strata in the society.

## Block Ext

### Link – China/Taiwan

#### We shouldn’t have to do much here their claim that “AFRO ASIA preserves and promotes critical thinking of and ACTIVISM in a global culture, creating a liberation praxis” and then say “Afro Asia allows reclamation of the interconnected revolutionary form of liberation that broadens the anti-racist and anti-imperialistic movements between the blacks of the U.S. and the Chinese.”

#### I dont know about you but Chinese are not representive of ALL Asian people and culture

#### Our Chang evidence has an organic understanding of the difference between Chinese and Taiwanese as well as OTHER CULTURES in Asia. The 1AC assumption of oneness if problematic and short-circuits their project – That’s the impact overview

#### And yes there is a difference between Chinese and Taiwanese people

Chang 11’

Keng-Wei Chang, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Bachelor of Science (BS), Computer Science, November 28, 2011, “Why don’t people of Taiwan identify with “China” NOW? — Taiwanese Perspective”, <https://ilhaformosaaltomtaiwan.wordpress.com/2011/11/28/taiwan-dont-identify-with-china-en/>

To make Taiwanese feel that Taiwanese culture is a part of Chinese culture and to identify themselves as Chinese: the easiest way to achieve this is to let Taiwanese feel that the culture in Taiwan now is the same as that in Mainland China. But due to the six decades of separation, people on different side of the Taiwan Strait have lived under different social system and climate. Thus the evolution of culture on the two sides and their attitudes toward traditional cultures have also varied significantly. It is this difference that makes Taiwanese feel the difference between Taiwan and China.

In terms of cultural evolution, the two sides of the Taiwan Strait have been through different political systems and their own historical events since 1949. This caused cultures in Taiwan and China, both originally part of the Sinosphere, to diverge. For example, the use of traditional and simplified written Chinese made the dictionaries of the two sides completely different. It is very likely that one day the difference in vocabulary between Taiwan and China will be more varied than the difference between British and American English.

Not to mention that people of Taiwan and China seldom have the same feeling or reaction toward the same event. For example, when Liu Xiang won the gold medal in the Olympics, Chinese people felt proud as ever while Taiwanese people felt nothing. On the other hand, when Chien-Ming Wang won in the MLB, Taiwanese people felt happier than ever while Chinese people had no idea who he is. The difference is even more obvious toward political events, for example when President Lee Tung-hui visited the US in 1995, Chinese and Taiwanese people had completely opposite reactions.

In terms of preservation of traditional cultures, significant difference exists between the two sides. Because of the “breaking down the four olds, setting up the fours news” and related activities in the Cultural Revolution, the Mainland China was not friendly towards the traditional cultures. This was one main reason where cultures in Taiwan and China diverged.

For example in the folk religions of Taiwan, our Buddhism and Taoism both have their roots traced to Mainland China. Mazu in Taiwan could be traced to Meizhou, Putian, Fujian. Sanshanguowang (literally “god of the three mountains”, an important deity for the Hakka people) could be traced to Chaozhou, Guangdong. But because of the Cultural Revolution, significant number of temples in Mainland China were damaged or destroyed, for example, the Mazu Temple in Meizhou and the Sanshanguowang Temple in Chaozhou. Statues in temples were destroyed, the building of the temples themselves were teared down, worship ceremonies were halted, while religious staff had to undergo struggle sessions and other prosecutions. Even though after reform many temples received assistance from their counterparts in Taiwan, the feelings of coming from the same origin are very much lost.

Moreover, as PRC promotes materialism and is officially an atheist state, religious activities are discouraged. The religious activities such as incense-offering and pilgrimage often seen in Taiwan ceased to exist in Mainland China. What originally was part of the traditional Chinese daily life grew deep roots in Taiwan instead. In the eyes of Taiwanese people, the so-called religious ceremonies and traditional activities in China have more value in performance than in the actual religious ideas. In Taiwan, they are part of the daily life.

And because the Chinese Communist Party has strict restriction towards religions, the CCP organization is a deep part of any religious organizations, creating many religious staff who often do not follow the teaching of the religions they are supposed to be serving. Buddhist monks often do not behave like monks, while daoshi (Taoism monks/priests) don’t behave like daoshi. The head of the Shaolin Temple on Songshan, Henan is given the title “CEO of Shaolin Temple”, commercializing the temple and made it lose the solemnity it is supposed to have.

On the other hand, Taiwan is an obvious contrast. The attitude towards folk religion and traditional cultures are completely different in Taiwan. Every town in Taiwan grows around the local central temple. The temple serves as a gathering place in farming villages for all sorts of different functions. Sometimes the temple even becomes where street food stands gather, creating night markets.

To worship the gods is a part of Taiwanese people’s lives (except for atheists and people believing in other religions). People go to the temples to ask for help when encountering any types of difficulties. From a modern perspective this might seen unscientific and superstitious, but people still follow the habits of their ancestors to ask for help from the gods. You can find couples asking for love from the Old Man under the Moon; students preparing for important exams asking for a smooth exam-taking from Wenchang Dijun (god of culture and literature); and wedded women asking for a healthy child from the the Maiden who brings Children. All these could be seen in temples around the island at any given point of time. While people relate their problems and hope to the gods in a faithful manner, what they are actually doing for the most part is showing their appreciations for the gods.

So in the Taiwanese religions, you will find people’s attitudes toward anything un-materialistic are sincerity, honesty, and respect. This spirit of sincerity, honesty, and respect is what symbolizes the Chinese culture, but these traditional values just don’t seem to exist in the hearts of Chinese people anymore.

### Link – Identity Politics

#### Focusing on identity justifies neoliberal takeover— Turns the aff— Focusing on identity allows neoliberalist to subvert the aff by establishing tokenism to a few and claiming liberation

Dr. Reed 13 “Marx, Race, and Neoliberalism”., Adolph Reed Jr. is a professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania, his research interest include American and Afro-American politics and political thought; urban politics, and American political development. New Labor Forum 22(1) 49–57 Copyright © 2013, The Murphy Institute. Accessed on 7/17/16

A second essentialist sleight-of-hand advances claims for the primacy of race/racism as an explanation of inequalities in the present by invoking analogies to regimes of explicitly racial subordination in the past. In these arguments, analogy stands in for evidence and explanation of the contemporary centrality of racism. Michelle Alexander’s widely read and cited book, The New Jim Crow, is only the most prominent expression of this tendency; even she has to acknowledge that the analogy fails because the historical circumstances are so radically different.

From the historical materialist standpoint, the view of racial inequality as a sui generis injustice and dichotomous formulations of the relation of race and class as systems of hierarchy in the United States are not only miscast but also fundamentally counterproductive. It is particularly important at this moment to recognize that the familiar taxonomy of racial difference is but one historically specific instance of a genus of ideologies of ascriptive hierarchy that stabilize capitalist social reproduction. I have argued previously that entirely new race-like taxonomies could come to displace the familiar ones. For instance, the “underclass” could become even more race-like as a distinctive, essentialized population, by our current folk norms, multiracial in composition, albeit most likely including in perceptibly greater frequencies people who would be classified as black and Latino “racially,” though as small enough pluralities to preclude assimilating the group ideologically as a simple proxy for nonwhite inferiors.

This possibility looms larger now. Struggles for racial and gender equality have largely divested race and gender of their common sense verisimilitude as bases for essential difference. Moreover, versions of racial and gender equality are now also incorporated into the normative and programmatic structure of “left” neoliberalism. Rigorous pursuit of equality of opportunity exclusively within the terms of given patterns of capitalist class relations—which is after all the ideal of racial liberalism—has been fully legitimized within the rubric of “diversity.” That ideal is realized through gaining rough parity in distribution of social goods and bads among designated population categories. As Walter Benn Michaels has argued powerfully, according to that ideal, the society would be just if 1 percent of the population controlled 90 percent of the resources, provided that blacks and other nonwhites, women, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) people were represented among the 1 percent in roughly similar proportion as their incidence in the general population.

### Impacts Ext

#### The impact is violence to the other – internal normalization constitutes deviance and violence. They can’t understand the traumatic colonial experience

**Hall 90**. STUART HALL is a professor in the Department of Social Science, The Open University, Milton Keynes. "Cultural identity and diaspora." (1990): 222-37. http://www.anthropology.ir/sites/default/files/hall\_cultural\_identity.pdf

It is only from this second position that we can properly **understand the traumatic** character of 'the **colonial experience'**. The ways in which black people, black experiences, were positioned and subject-ed in the dominant regimes of representation **were the effects of** a critical exercise of cultural **power and normalisation**. Not only, in Said's 'Orientalist' sense, were we constructed as different and other within the categories of knowledge of the West by those regimes. They had the power to make us see and experience ourselves as 'Other'. Every regime of representation is a regime of power formed, as Foucault reminds us, by the fatal couplet, 'power/knowledge'. But this kind of knowledge is internal, not external. It is one thing to position a subject or set of peoples as the Other of a dominant discourse. It is quite another thing to subject them to that 'knowledge', not only as a matter of imposed will and domination, **by the power of inner compulsion** and subjective con-formation to the norm. **That is the lesson** - the sombre majesty - **of Fanon**'s insight into the colonising experience in Black Skin, White Masks.

This inner expropriation of cultural identity cripples and deforms. **If** its silences are **not resisted, they produce, in Fanon's vivid phrase, 'individuals without an anchor**, without horizon, colourless, stateless, rootless - a race of angels'.2 Nevertheless, this idea of **otherness as an inner compulsion changes our conception of** 'cultural **identity'**. In this perspective, cultural **identity is not a fixed essence at all**, lying unchanged outside history and culture. **It is not** some **universal and transcendental** spirit inside us on which history has made no fundamental mark. It is not once-and-for-all. **It is not a fixed origin to which we can make some final and absolute Return**. Of course, it is not a mere phantasm either. It is something - not a mere trick of the imagination. It has its histories - and histories have their real, material and symbolic effects. The past continues to speak to us. But it no longer addresses us as a simple, factual 'past', since our relation to **it**, like the child's relation to the mother, **is always-already 'after the break'.** It is always constructed through memory, fantasy, narrative and myth. Cultural identities are the points of identification, the unstable points of identification or suture, which are made, within the discourses of history and culture. **Not an essence but a positioning**. Hence, **there is always a politics of identity**, a politics of position, which has no absolute guarantee in an unproblematic, transcendental 'law of origin'.

This second view of cultural identity is much less familiar, and more unsettling. If identity does not proceed, in a straight, unbroken line, from some fixed origin, how are we to understand its formation? **We might think of** black Caribbean **identities as 'framed' by** two axes or **vectors, simultaneously operative**: the vector of similarity and continuity; and the vector of difference and rupture. Caribbean **identities always have to be thought of in terms of the dialogic relationship between** these two **axes**. The one gives us some grounding in, some continuity with, the past. The second reminds us that what we share is precisely the experience of a profound discontinuity: the peoples dragged into slavery, transportation, colonisation, migration, came predominantly from Africa - and when that supply ended, it was temporarily refreshed by indentured labour from the Asian subcontinent. (This neglected fact explains why, when you visit Guyana or Trinidad, you see, symbolically inscribed in the faces of their peoples, the paradoxical 'truth' of Christopher Columbus's mistake: you can find 'Asia' by sailing west, if you know where to look!) In the history of the modern world, there are few more traumatic ruptures to match these enforced separations from Africa - already figured, in the European imaginary, as 'the Dark Continent'. But the slaves were also from different countries, tribal communities, villages, languages and gods. African religion, which has been so profoundly formative in Caribbean spiritual life, is precisely different from Christian monotheism in believing that God is so powerful that he can only be known through a proliferation of spiritual manifestations, present everywhere in the natural and social world. These gods live on, in an underground existence, **in the hybridised religious universe** of Haitian voodoo, pocomania, Native pentacostalism, Black baptism, Rastafarianism and the black Saints Latin American Catholicism. The paradox is that it was the uprooting of slavery and transportation and the insertion into the plantation economy (as well as the symbolic economy) of **the** Western **world that 'unified' these peoples** across their differences, in the same moment as it **cut them off from direct access to their past**.

**Difference**, therefore, **persists** - in and alongside continuity. To return to the Caribbean after any long absence is to experience again the shock of the 'doubleness' of similarity and difference. Visiting the French Caribbean for the first time, I also saw at once how different Martinique is from, say, Jamaica: and this is no mere difference of topography or climate. It is a profound difference of culture and history. **And the difference matters**. It positions Martiniquains and Jamaicans as both the same and different. Moreover, the boundaries of difference are continually repositioned in relation to different points of reference. Vis-a-vis the developed West, we are very much 'the same'. We belong to the marginal, the underdeveloped, the periphery, the 'Other'. We are at the outer edge, the 'rim', of the metropolitan world - always 'South' to someone else's El Norte.

At the same time, we do not stand in the same relation of the 'otherness' to the metropolitan centres. Each has negotiated its economic, political and cultural dependency differently. And this **'difference'**, whether we like it or not, **is already inscribed in our cultural identities**. In turn, it is this negotiation of identity which makes us, vis-a-vis other Latin American people, with a very similar history, different - Caribbeans, les Antilliennes ('islanders' to their mainland). And yet, vis-a-vis one another, Jamaican, Haitian, Cuban, Guadeloupean, Barbadian, etc ...

### AT: Perm

#### We solve the aff— the K must come 1st. Affirming historical materialism as a lens to evaluate anti-blackness is key to aff solvency. Our evidence assumes the perm and concludes that affirming identity doom our method to fail.

Dr. Reed 13 “Marx, Race, and Neoliberalism”., Adolph Reed Jr. is a professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania, his research interest include American and Afro-American politics and political thought; urban politics, and American political development. New Labor Forum 22(1) 49–57 Copyright © 2013, The Murphy Institute. Accessed on 7/17/16

Finally, the adamant commitment to a race first perspective on inequalities that show up as statistical disparities has a material foundation. The victories of the civil rights movement carried with them a more benign and unavoidable political imperative. Legal remedies can be sought for injustices understood as discrimination on the basis of race, gender, or other familiar categories of invidious ascription; no such recourse exists for injustices generated through capitalism’s logic of production and reproduction without mediation through one of those ascriptive categories. As I have argued elsewhere, this makes identifying “racism” a technical requirement for pursuing certain grievances, not the basis of an overall strategy for pursuit of racial justice, or, as I believe is a clearer left formulation, racial equality as an essential component of a program of social justice.17

Yet, for those who insist that racial reductionism is more than a pragmatic accommodation to the necessities of pursuing legal or administrative grievances, something more is at play. A historical materialist perspective can be helpful for identifying the glue that binds that commitment to a race-first political discourse and practice.

All politics in capitalist society is class, or at least a class-inflected, politics. That is also true of the political perspective that condenses in programs such as reparations, antiracism, and insistence on the sui generis character of racial injustice. I submit that those tendencies come together around a politics that is “entirely consistent with the neoliberal redefinition of equality and democracy along disparitarian lines.” That politics reflects the social position of those positioned to benefit from the view that the market is, or can be, a just, effective, or even acceptable, system for rewarding talent and virtue and punishing their opposites and that, therefore, removal of “artificial” impediments to functioning like race and gender will make it even more efficient and just.18

### AT: Our method is good/ Impx OV

#### We access you’re Davis evidence better—Davis ask us to find “a call to develop a vocabulary that permits us to have insightful conversations.” If we win that the rhetoric of the 1AC is toxic or ineffective we win the debate.

#### We agree that using “obsolete vocabularies” we cant have an appropriate conversation about anti-blackness in its totality. The Affirmative conflation of China and Taiwan as being one IS an incorrect vocabulary conflations of Chinese as Taiwanese produces as language that justifies the erasure of Taiwanese from the Afro-Asia dynamic that is an independent reason to vote neg that’s Chang ev

#### This proves our method must come first and is mutually exclusive to theirs. You’re role as an academic must affirm Davis’s call for finding the MOST APPROPRIATE vocabulary if we win any of our links that disproves the viability if the aff.

#### Also, Their strategy isn’t concrete enough simply saying <insert aff here> is nothing more than a password for others to join their movement. They don’t go far enough and if they do it isn’t said in a way that others can coalesce around.

Dr. Reed 9/09 The limits of anti-racism by Adolph Reed Jr., Adolph Reed Jr. is a professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania, his research interest include American and Afro-American politics and political thought; urban politics, and American political development. Left Business Observer #121, September 2009. Copyright 2009, Left Business Observer. http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Antiracism.html

Antiracism is a favorite concept on the American left these days. Of course, all good sorts want to be against racism, but what does the word mean exactly?

Tasty bunny

All too often, “racism” is the subject of sentences that imply intentional activity or is characterized as an autonomous “force.” In this kind of formulation, “racism,” a conceptual abstraction, is imagined as a material entity. Abstractions can be useful, but they shouldn’t be given independent life.

I can appreciate such formulations as transient political rhetoric; hyperbolic claims made in order to draw attention and galvanize opinion against some particular injustice. But as the basis for social interpretation, and particularly interpretation directed toward strategic political action, they are useless. Their principal function is to feel good and tastily righteous in the mouths of those who propound them. People do things that reproduce patterns of racialized inequality, sometimes with self-consciously bigoted motives, sometimes not. Properly speaking, however, “racism” itself doesn’t do anything more than the Easter Bunny does.

Yes, racism exists, as a conceptual condensation of practices and ideas that reproduce, or seek to reproduce, hierarchy along lines defined by race. Apostles of antiracism frequently can’t hear this sort of statement, because in their exceedingly simplistic version of the nexus of race and injustice there can be only the Manichean dichotomy of those who admit racism’s existence and those who deny it. There can be only Todd Gitlin (the sociologist and former SDS leader who has become, both fairly and as caricature, the symbol of a “class-first” line) and their own heroic, truth-telling selves, and whoever is not the latter must be the former. Thus the logic of straining to assign guilt by association substitutes for argument.

My position is—and I can’t count the number of times I’ve said this bluntly, yet to no avail, in response to those in blissful thrall of the comforting Manicheanism—that of course racism persists, in all the disparate, often unrelated kinds of social relations and “attitudes” that are characteristically lumped together under that rubric, but from the standpoint of trying to figure out how to combat even what most of us would agree is racial inequality and injustice, that acknowledgement and $2.25 will get me a ride on the subway. It doesn’t lend itself to any particular action except more taxonomic argument about what counts as racism.

#### Your engagement causes interracial debates that fracture the movement along the lines of you are black enough to be apart of our project

Dr. Reed 9/09 The limits of anti-racism by Adolph Reed Jr., Adolph Reed Jr. is a professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania, his research interest include American and Afro-American politics and political thought; urban politics, and American political development. Left Business Observer #121, September 2009. Copyright 2009, Left Business Observer. http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Antiracism.html

And here’s a practical catch-22. In the logic of antiracism, exposure of the racial element of an instance of wrongdoing will lead to recognition of injustice, which in turn will lead to remedial action—though not much attention seems ever given to how this part is supposed to work. I suspect this is because the exposure part, which feels so righteously yet undemandingly good, is the real focus. But this exposure convinces only those who are already disposed to recognize.

Those who aren’t so disposed have multiple layers of obfuscating ideology, mainly forms of victim-blaming, through which to deny that a given disparity stems from racism or for that matter is even unjust. The Simi Valley jury’s reaction to the Rodney King tape, which saw King as perp and the cops as victims, is a classic illustration. So is “underclass” discourse. Victimization by subprime mortgage scams can be, and frequently is, dismissed as the fault of irresponsible poor folks aspiring beyond their means. And there is no shortage of black people in the public eye—Bill Cosby and Oprah Winfrey are two prime examples, as is Barack Obama—who embrace and recycle those narratives of poor black Americans’ wayward behavior and self-destructive habits.

And how does a simple narrative of “racism” account for the fact that so many black institutions, including churches and some racial advocacy organizations, and many, many black individuals actively promoted those risky mortgages as making the “American Dream of home ownership” possible for “us”? Sure, there are analogies available—black slave traders, slave snitches, “Uncle Toms” and various race traitors—but those analogies are moral judgments, not explanations. And to mention them only opens up another second-order debate about racial authenticity—about who “really” represents the black community. Even Clarence Thomas sees himself as a proud black man representing the race’s best interests.

My point is that it’s more effective politically to challenge the inequality and injustice directly and bypass the debate over whether it should be called “racism.”

I do recognize that, partly because of the terms on which the civil rights movement’s victories have been achieved, there is a strong practical imperative for stressing the racially invidious aspects of injustices: they have legal remedies. Race is one of the legal classes protected by anti-discrimination law; poverty, for instance, is not. But this makes identifying “racism” a technical requirement for pursuing certain grievances, not the basis of an overall political strategy for pursuit of racial justice, or, as I believe is a clearer left formulation, racial equality as an essential component of a program of social justice.